

991 Philippine independence
J72 speech of W.A. Jones in
House of representatives
May 1, 1916.

Anno 1778.

PHILLIPS·ACADEMY



OLIVER·WENDELL·HOLMES
LIBRARY



PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

"The people of every country are the only safe guardians
of their own rights."—*Thomas Jefferson.*

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. JONES
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES .

MAY 1, 1916



WASHINGTON
1916

41551—15659

991-572

33434

L



991
J72

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. JONES,
OF VIRGINIA.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, it is just 18 years ago to-day since Admiral Dewey, at the head of an American squadron, triumphantly entered Manila Bay, destroyed the fleet under the command of Admiral Montejo, and sounded forever the death knell of Spanish dominion in the Philippine Islands. [Applause.]

It will be just 14 years on the the 1st day of July next since President Roosevelt affixed his signature to the act of Congress under which the Philippine Islands have been governed from that day to this.

That act, described in its title as a temporary measure, was designed as a substitute for the autocratic military government under which the Filipinos had been theretofore governed. It was never intended by its sponsors to serve as a permanent form of government, and it has long since outlived its usefulness.

The bill now under consideration by this House has a two-fold purpose. It gives the Filipino people a more liberal and autonomous government, thus conferring upon them larger control of their public and political affairs than they are now permitted to exercise. The life of this government, however, is to expire so soon as American sovereignty shall cease to exist over the islands, which, the bill declares, shall occur in not less than two nor more than four years after its passage, provided that the President, by proclamation, may extend the time to the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years, in the event that the condition in respect to the stability or efficiency of the external or internal affairs of the Philippines shall warrant him in so doing.

The necessity for the enactment by Congress of a new organic law for the Philippines is not questioned by anybody. It is stated in the views of the minority members of the Committee on Insular Affairs that—

The minority entirely agree with the majority that the Philippines should be given a new fundamental law, granting to the people a larger measure of self-government.

And the fact that the only section of this bill to which any reference is made by the minority is that which relates to the independence of the islands amply justifies the conclusion that the provisional government provided for is not unsatisfactory to them.

The justice for the demand that the Filipino people be immediately given a larger measure of self-government being conceded, and no objection having been raised to the governmental features of the bill, it would be a waste of the time of this House to enter upon any detailed discussion of the changes which it effects in the present organic law. I shall therefore only direct the attention of the House to one or two of the more important changes. The most important of these is that which establishes a Philippine legislature to be composed of two houses, one the senate and the other the house of representatives.

The senate is designed to take the place of the present Philippine Commission, an appointive body composed of nine members. As is well known, this commission now constitutes the upper branch of the Philippine Legislature, and also exercises exclusive legislative and other jurisdiction over all the non-Christian and noncivilized peoples of the islands. The archipelago is divided into 12 senatorial districts, each of which is to be represented by two senators. One of these districts embraces the territory inhabited by the non-Christian and noncivilized tribes, and its two senators are to be appointed by the Governor General. The representatives of the other 11 senatorial districts are to be elected by the qualified voters of those districts.

The house of representatives is to be composed of 90 members, 81 of whom shall be elected in the districts now provided by law; the remaining 9 are to be appointed by the Governor General, and they will represent the noncivilized and non-Christianized territory.

The President of the United States is authorized to appoint a Governor General, a vice governor, an auditor and a deputy auditor, a director of civil service, and the chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court. All other officers are to be appointed by the Governor General with the approval of the Philippine Senate. The Governor General is given a qualified veto power.

One other important change which this bill makes in the present organic law is that which relates to the suffrage. The present educational qualification requires that all voters must be able to read and write either Spanish or English. This bill provides that they must be able to read and write either Spanish, English, or a native language. This will necessarily greatly enlarge the present electorate. Its justice is so obvious as to leave no room for discussion. There are many thousand literate Filipinos who speak neither English nor Spanish. Many of these are at least as well qualified to exercise the right of suffrage as the nonnative inhabitants who only speak a foreign language.

When the bill is read for amendment under the five-minute rule, I shall take pleasure in explaining the provisions of the bill more in detail, in the event that explanation is desired. I shall now proceed to discuss, as briefly as I may, that section which withdraws the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippines and confers upon them full and complete independence after a specified period.

This section is known as the Clarke amendment. It is the only section over which there has been any controversy, the only one that has proven a stumbling block to our friends of the minority.

Some misapprehension seems to exist as to the history as well as the scope and meaning of the Clarke amendment. The impression seems to prevail in some quarters that the Clarke amendment was substituted in the Senate for the preamble to the bill which passed this House by an overwhelming majority in the Sixty-third Congress. Senate bill 381, now the subject of consideration, as introduced in that body did not contain the House bill preamble, which declared that the Philippines should be granted their independence as soon as a stable government was established therein. The preamble of the Senate bill, as introduced, declared it to be the purpose of the United States to grant independence to the people of the Philippine Islands when, in the judgment of the United States, they "shall have shown themselves to be fitted therefor." As reported to the Senate, this language was so changed as to read that independence should be granted when "it will be to the permanent interest of the people of the Philippine Islands." To say to the Philippine people that they shall be granted their independence when they have shown themselves to be fitted therefor would be to offer a gratuitous insult to an intelligent, brave, and sensitive people. To tell them that independence shall be theirs when, in the judgment of the United States, it will be to their permanent interest would be a cruel mockery. Such a declaration of purpose ignores completely the interest of the American people. It might result—and, in the opinion of many people, would result—in compelling the United States to retain possession of the Philippine Islands forever. No matter what the cost in blood or in treasure, it would bind the United States to hold and protect them through all time. It would destroy the dearest hope and the loftiest aspirations of the Filipino people and plunge them into blackest gloom and despair. It would add immeasurably to the difficulties of American administration of their affairs, and if it did not eventually lead to revolution it would at least kindle the fires of distrust and hatred of the American people in the heart of every patriotic Filipino.

It was this declaration of purpose in the bill which we are now considering for which the Clarke amendment was substituted. It was not a question between the promise of independence so soon as a stable government should be established in the Philippine Islands, as contained in the House preamble, and the promise of independence at a specified period, as set forth in the Clarke amendment, that the Senate was called upon to vote. The choice presented to the Senate was between a vague, indefinite, meaningless, and almost inconceivable proposition and an honest effort to redeem the solemn promises which the Democratic Party, at least, have been making the Philippine people for the past decade and a half.

The Clarke amendment is much broader in scope and more comprehensive in meaning than is admitted by its critics. A systematic, well-organized, and persistent effort has been made to create the impression that it ignores American and other foreign interests in the Philippines. On the contrary, it specifically clothes the President of the United States with the power and authority to make such orders and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of the Philippines as may be necessary to finally settle and adjust all property rights

and other relations as between the United States and the Philippines, to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries resident or engaged in business in the islands or having property interests therein.

The President is thus invested with full power to take every step that is possible to protect and safeguard every American or other foreign interest in the islands; and, to my mind, it would be difficult to make the language which is employed in the bill more binding upon the Chief Executive of the United States or more comprehensive in its scope.

But our friends of the minority insist that the authority thus conferred upon the President to settle and adjust personal and property rights between citizens of the United States and the Philippines is not broad enough to cover certain Philippine bonds issued under authority of Congress. They argue that any promise or guaranty given by the Philippine government either as to property rights or the rights of the holders of Philippine bonds, which they distinguish from property rights, would be worthless. My reply to this is that no President of the United States would ever draw so nice a distinction as this, thus discriminating between different classes of American investors in the Philippines. I may say further, however, for the benefit of holders of Philippine bonds who honestly hold this opinion, that I have assurances that the administration will ask Congress to remove all doubt that could possibly exist upon this subject by specifically clothing the President with the power and authority to safeguard, as far as it is possible to do so, the interests of every holder of Philippine bonds. That it would not be possible for the President to do this, I do not believe for one moment, and therefore I feel that every American investment in the islands will be as safe under Philippine sovereignty as under the sovereignty of this country.

It is not contended that the United States is in any way legally responsible for the payment of these Philippine bonds, which amount, in the aggregate, to \$16,125,000. It is claimed, because they were issued and sold under authority conferred by Congress upon the Philippine government, that some moral obligation rests on the United States to see to their payment. It is true that the average price at which they sold was something over 6 per cent above par. They all bear 4 per cent interest, and are exempt from all taxation in the United States as well as in the Philippines, and had they been guaranteed by the United States they would probably have sold for 20 per cent, or even more, above par. They are now selling for less than par; but if Congress were to guarantee their payment, their price would at once advance to something like 12 per cent above par. However, I have assurances from representatives of the American Banking Association that if Congress will specifically authorize the President to take such steps as may be possible to safeguard the payment of these bonds, such action will be satisfactory. I feel sure, as I have indicated, that this will be done, and I trust that when it is done it will put at ease all holders of Philippine bonds.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Just for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to know whether, if the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands was turned over to the Philippine people they would not be able to repudiate the bonds which were issued, and which are guaranteed by the Philippine government as it stands to-day, for the construction of that railroad.

Mr. JONES. No; I think not, if the President of the United States carries out in good faith—as I believe will be done—the authority conferred upon him in this bill. [Applause.] However, I will say again that I have assurances from representatives of the American Banking Association that if Congress will specifically authorize the President to take such steps as may be possible to safeguard the payment of these bonds, such action will be satisfactory. I feel sure, as I have indicated, that this will be done, and I trust that when it is done it will put at ease all holders of Philippine bonds.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield just for a question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the bankers accept the security of the Philippine government and their guaranty or the guaranty of our Government?

Mr. JONES. I am assured by representatives of the American Banking Association that if specific authority is conferred upon the President of the United States to make such arrangements with the Philippine government that is to be set up in the islands in the event of independence, as it is possible for him to make, it will be satisfactory to that important association.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose the Government should fail——

Mr. JONES. I can not enter into a discussion of that supposition with the gentleman. He starts out with suppose this and suppose that.

The Philippine government has also guaranteed the payment of interest for a limited term of years upon certain railway bonds, the proceeds of which may have been used in constructing railroads in the islands. The holders of the interest-guaranteed bonds of the Manila Railway Co. do not appear to be disturbed over the Clarke amendment. That corporation, for reasons upon which I do not care to enter at this time, appears to be in a bad way financially, and negotiations are pending by which the Philippine government will in all probability take over its property. The President of the Philippine Railway Co., however, appears to be greatly perturbed in mind lest Philippine independence may result in loss to the holders of the interest-guaranteed bonds of his corporation; and, in response to a circular letter sent out by him to the holders of these bonds, Members of Congress are being deluged with letters calling upon them to vote against the Clarke amendment unless some provision is made by which these bonds shall be protected. It is not claimed that the moral obligation of the United States to meet the interest and provide for the ultimate redemption of these bonds is quite so strong as that which exists in the case of the Philippine bonds; but it is stated in the views of the minority that subscriptions for these bonds were received by the Bureau of Insular Affairs. I do not know upon what authority this statement is made, but I do know that it is absolutely groundless. It is true that in an advertisement of an issue of these bonds in 1908 it was stated that the subscription would

be opened simultaneously by certain financial institutions and the Bureau of Insular Affairs; but no subscriptions were ever received by that bureau, and such communications as were received were at once transmitted to William Salomon & Co., bankers, of New York City, who signed this advertisement. The first advertisement of these bonds did not name the Bureau of Insular Affairs as one of the places where subscriptions would be received, but inasmuch as the bids received were disappointing to the syndicate underwriting these railroad obligations its purpose in including the Bureau of Insular Affairs in the subsequent advertisement was evidently to induce the public to pay a higher price for them. These bonds were publicly sold as low as 86 cents on the dollar, and I am informed that at private sales they sold for as low as 60 cents on the dollar. They are now selling for something like 46 cents on the dollar. Should the Government of the United States guarantee their payment, their present value would be more than doubled, and their holders would thus pocket several million dollars. It is only necessary to state these facts in order to make it plain that no Member of this House would have the temerity, if he had the desire, to vote to make the United States responsible for these railroad bonds, which the act of Congress which authorized the Philippine government to guarantee their interest expressly declared should not be sold for less than par. By what legerdemain they were actually sold for less than par is another story. So much for the argument that the Philippines should not be granted their independence so long as their bonded indebtedness is not in some way guaranteed by the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Philippine bonds are exempted from taxation in the United States. What becomes of that exemption if we surrender sovereignty in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES. That exemption stands, and these bonds will never be subject to taxation in the United States.

Mr. HILL. They will be in the position of bonds of a foreign country exempted from taxation by our own people.

Mr. JONES. That is true; but it will have been done under very peculiar circumstances, and inasmuch as these bonds are held for the most part by American citizens I do not think the gentleman would vote to remove that exemption.

Mr. HILL. I do not know. I want to find out what the result of this bill is.

Mr. COADY. At what price did the gentleman say these bonds sold?

Mr. JONES. They sold on the market for as low as 86 cents on the dollar, and I understand they are selling now for about 45 cents on the dollar.

Mr. COADY. I would like to correct the gentleman, if he will permit me.

Mr. JONES. I hope the gentleman will do it in his own time, because these figures are absolutely correct. I have them from the War Department. [Applause.]

Mr. COADY. I have documents here from one of the savings banks of Baltimore city, which shows that they were bought at 95.

Mr. JONES. Some of them were sold at 95, but I said in my remarks that others were sold at public auction for as low as 86. I did not undertake to say what the highest price was, but none ever sold as high as par, and Congress provided in the act which authorized their issue that not one dollar should be sold for less than par. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONES. With pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. Assuming that the bill passes and four years elapse; you have that independence on paper in the Philippines and the 4 per cent bonds—I am not speaking of the railway bonds—are exempt from taxation in the United States and have not been paid, and that we have in the Philippines the conditions that we have substantially now in Mexico, what would be the attitude of the Government of the United States? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JONES. In the first place I shall not assume that we will ever have in the Philippines such conditions as prevail in the Republic of Mexico to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not think that any gentleman who understands the difference between the character of the inhabitants of Mexico and that of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands would for one moment suggest a comparison between the two. [Applause.]

The manufacturers of certain American products, for which they have been finding a market in the Philippines, have also been busy in urging Members of Congress to vote against the Clarke amendment upon the ground that the alienation of the Philippines would mean to them the loss of that market. A manufacturer of cotton goods, claiming to represent 13 such concerns, recently strove to convince me that the Clarke amendment should not be adopted because it would mean an annual loss to the cotton manufacturers of a trade approximating \$5,000,000 in value. He made the astounding statement, too, that the manufacturers' profit on these goods did not exceed 5 per cent of their value. In other words, according to this manufacturer of cotton goods, it is the duty of the United States to retain possession of the Philippines indefinitely in order that he and his associates may put into their pockets the sum of \$250,000 annually. Thus the altruistic arguments for retaining possession of the Philippines, so eloquently voiced by McKinley, Taft, and other Republican leaders, are now giving place to those of commercialism. The mask of altruism, heretofore concealing the real purposes and designs of the imperialistic advocates of colonialism, has at last been cast aside, and we are now given to see that the real, animating purpose of those who would retain possession of the Philippines forever, in utter disregard of the cost and danger involved in such a course to the United States, and in cruel indifference to the God-given rights of the Filipino people, is based in commercial greed. [Applause.] Precious little, if anything, is now heard of the high-sounding doctrine "The Philippines for the Filipinos." It has ceased to be the party cry of those who oppose Philippine independence. They are now openly and shamelessly appealing to the forces of selfishness and greed, heedless of the fact that it was President McKinley who said, "The Philippines are not ours to exploit, but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government." [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. No; not just now, if the gentleman will excuse me.

The minority ask, "If we 'Mexicanize' the Philippines, what will become of the property and lives of the Americans there." They would create the impression that if the Philippines are granted independence the lives and property of American residents of those islands would be as unsafe as they are in Mexico. This is a baseless and wholly unwarranted assumption. There is not the slightest similitude between the character, temperament, and disposition of the inhabitants of the Philippines and those of Mexico. Their peoples are so totally dissimilar in every important particular that no comparison between them is possible. The contrast is as light to darkness.

The Mexicans number 15,000,000, 80 per cent of whom are peons or savages, and of those only 2 per cent can read and write. So densely ignorant are the masses in Mexico and so utterly devoid of civic virtue that there were less than 20,000 votes cast when Madero was chosen President of the Republic. The great bulk of the Mexicans are turbulent, lawless, vengeful, treacherous, cruel, without respect for constituted authority, and utterly callous to all human rights. They entertain no regard for law and order and are amenable only to superior force. How about the Filipino people? More than half of them are literate and more than 90 per cent civilized and christianized. Although the Mexicans outnumber them as two to one and despite the fact that under the educational qualification which obtains in the Philippines and which limits that class of the electorate to those who can read and write either English or Spanish, considerably more than 200,000 votes are polled at their elections. The Moros, who constitute the only disturbing element in the whole Archipelago, number less than 4 per cent of the entire population, whilst in Mexico 40 per cent, or 6,000,000, of its population are pure-blood Indian savages. The Filipinos are an intelligent, docile, kindly, generous, peace-loving, Christian, law-abiding people, and their whole history belies the unjust imputation that they are to be compared to the desperadoes who infest Mexico and render property rights and even human life insecure. Nowhere is there to be found a higher type of the educated, refined, and cultured citizen than is to be found in the Philippines, and nothing is further from the truth than the statement so often upon the lips of those who would hold the Filipinos in perpetual bondage that they are an illiterate and densely ignorant people. There are those among them who have won distinction in every branch of higher learning—in medicine and in law, in literature and in philosophy, in science and in art. And there are about 500,000 Filipino children attending public schools and being taught in English. It is true that this does not embrace all the Filipino children of school age, but let us not forget that there are a number of States in our American Union where from 35 to 45 per cent of children of school age have never entered a schoolhouse.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman cite those States?

Mr. JONES. I will furnish the gentleman with their names, but I can not do it offhand. I have examined the United States

census and these figures are absolutely correct. I might feel some delicacy in giving the names of these States out of regard for my friend from Minnesota, for it may be that his is one of those States.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will state that 98 per cent of the people in Minnesota above the age of 8 years can read and write. I will ask the gentleman if the States that he mentions are not south of Mason and Dixon's line?

Mr. JONES. No; that is not true.

Even in the department of Mindanao and Sulu, where civil authority has with such marked success been substituted for military, many primary schools are now in successful operation, where Moros and Filipinos are being instructed side by side in the English language. These schools are not locally maintained, the funds therefor being largely provided out of the insular treasury, thus annihilating the oft-repeated slander that such a feeling of hatred exists between the Filipinos and the Moros that the former can not be intrusted with the government of the latter.

If the question of the future political status of the Philippine people is to be determined upon the basis of dollars and cents rather than that of justice and right, the sooner they are granted independence the better it will be for the American taxpayer. [Applause.]

The Philippines are costing the United States annually a larger sum than their total bonded obligations added to the total value of the cotton manufactures imported from the United States, about which Members of Congress are hearing so much these days. As a purely financial proposition, therefore, the American people could well afford, if relieved from the cost of holding the Philippines, to pay off every bond for which the Philippine Government is responsible, and to make the cotton manufacturers the gift of a sum equal to the total value of their exports to the Philippines. [Applause.]

It has not until recently been seriously claimed by any one familiar with the situation that the Philippines would ever prove commercially valuable to the United States. Mr. Taft and others have repeatedly admitted they never would, but the advocates of retention point to the fact that since the beginning of the European war the trade between the United States and the Philippines has greatly increased, and they argue therefrom that if it continues to increase in the same proportion it will, in a few years, justify from a commercial standpoint the indefinite retention of the islands. They apparently forget that the European war can not last forever, and they utterly ignore the fact that if it shall be decided to hold the Filipinos indefinitely they must be included in any program for national defense which Congress may adopt.

There may be room for difference of opinion as to what constitutes ample provision for national defense, but there can be none as to the obligation of the United States to defend every foot of territory over which the American flag floats, and the obligation to defend the Philippines against foreign attack, if they are to be held indefinitely, will be all the stronger, since they are held against the will of their people.

Many of those who favor the retention of the Philippines are among the most extreme advocates of what is called national preparedness. Do they realize what it would mean to the taxpayers of America to fortify and defend the Philippines on land and on sea? Already more than \$10,000,000 have been expended in fortifying the entrance to the Bay of Manila. Who can say what it will cost to fortify all of the important ports of the entire Archipelago? There are now only 12,000 American soldiers in the islands. Who believes that 200,000 will be sufficient to garrison the forts that must be constructed and to defend the islands in the event of attack by some powerful nation? But it will require more than strong fortifications and large armies to successfully defend the Philippines against foreign invasion. To do so with any hope of success will necessitate the constant presence in the Orient of an American fleet at least equal in strength to that of any naval power which may attempt to seize the islands; and yet, whatever may be the cost in blood and in treasure of defending them, we shall be bound by every consideration of justice, honor, and national pride to undertake to do so, if it shall be determined to hold them permanently. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that it would be impossible to successfully defend them against any first-class military and naval power. Without the loyal and united support and cooperation of the Philippine people it would not be possible, in my judgment, for the United States to hold and defend the islands against foreign aggression. Notwithstanding that Spain conferred upon the Philippines the inestimable blessing of the Christian religion, so deep was the desire for liberty implanted in the hearts of the Filipino that they hailed with delight the advent of the soldiers of America, and eagerly joined with them in driving out the Spaniards; and if whilst holding them in subjection we shall become involved in some great conflict, may we not, with reason, expect that history will repeat itself?

I dismiss as unworthy of serious consideration the absurd and utterly untenable argument so frequently advanced that the Philippine people are incapable of maintaining their independence, and, if given it, must sooner or later become the prey of some stronger power, for this may be truthfully said of most of the nations of the earth. It is true as to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, and other countries of Europe. It is true of each and all of the Republics of South and Central America, and the halls of this Chamber have echoed for months with dismal forebodings as to the present ability of our own great Nation to successfully maintain itself against foreign attack. Even an international guaranty of the independence of poor, stricken Belgium did not save that gallant little nation from the horrible fate which has overtaken it. If, therefore, the Philippines are not to be given their independence until they are capable of maintaining it in arms, then they are doomed to everlasting political servitude.

Another of the stock arguments of the opponents of Philippine independence is that the Filipinos lack a common language. When the real facts are considered in the light of the history of the world, it will be seen that this argument, too, is entitled to little respect.

Half of the Philippine people speak either Visayan or Tagalog, and more speak English than any other tongue; so that with more than half a million children being daily taught in English, the day is not far distant when English will be the common medium of intercommunication throughout the archipelago.

But, Mr. Chairman, is it true that national spirit and national unity can not exist in the absence of a common language? Within the narrow limits of the British Isles Welsh, Cornish, Gaelic, and Scotch are spoken, and the names of the different languages spoken throughout the British colonies are legion. In Quebec, for instance, although for more than a hundred years under British dominion, French is universally spoken. There are four different languages spoken in Switzerland, and I shall not venture to give the number of those in Austria-Hungary. It has recently been ascertained that there are 41 languages and 51 dialects spoken in Mexico, and yet the wretched condition into which the unhappy country has sunk has never, I think, been attributed to the multiplicity of its languages.

Of the many indefensible arguments advanced by the imperialists against granting Philippine independence about the most absurd and groundless is that the Filipinos themselves do not desire it. I shall not be surprised if, during the course of this debate, some one does not have the temerity to make this claim and even to undertake to establish it by the production of a petition signed by a score or more Filipinos protesting against the passage of this bill. Then, too, it is highly probable that we shall be told that the Democratic Party in the Philippines has adopted resolutions protesting against the passage of this bill.

It may be true that there are a few Filipinos who are willing to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, but there is no Democratic Party in the Philippines. Four years ago, as now, a few Americans domiciled in Manila got together and adopted a set of resolutions, and actually undertook to accredit delegates to the Baltimore convention, but that convention very promptly, and very properly, refused to accept their credentials or to permit them to participate in its deliberations.

It ought not to be denied by anybody that the Filipinos as a whole desire independence. This is abundantly testified to by the sacrifices they have made and the blood they have shed in their efforts to secure it. The desire for freedom is universal. It is confined to no class or condition of men, and it pervades every part of the civilized and Christianized portions of the islands.

The fires of liberty, kindled in the hearts of the Filipinos by such patriots as the martyred Rizal, have never died out and they will never cease to burn so long as the spirit of freedom shall continue to animate mankind.

The minority undertake to support their contention that it is unwise to fix a definite date for Philippine independence by quoting the opinions upon this subject expressed years ago by ex-Presidents Roosevelt and Taft. Instead of informing us as to the views held in the past by former President Roosevelt it would have been more to the point to have been told what are the present views of that Republican statesman. In his book entitled "Fear God and Take Your Own Part," recently pub-

lished, Mr. Roosevelt comes out squarely and unequivocally for Philippine independence. He says:

We have promised the Filipinos independence in terms which were inevitably understood to be independence in the immediate future.

And he adds:

Let us, then, as speedily as possible, leave the Philippines; and as the Philippines desire us to leave we would be quit of all moral obligations for them, and would under no circumstances be obliged to defend them from other nations.

Realizing, as every other intelligent American must, the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of defending a group of islands extending over a wide area and 7,000 miles distant from our shores, Mr. Roosevelt declares that "Alaska, Hawaii, our own coasts, and the Panama Canal and its approaches" constitute "the military problem with which we should grapple." In view of the fact that Mr. Roosevelt will in likelihood be the next presidential candidate of the Republican Party, I commend his latest and most unequivocal utterances in respect to the future political status of the Philippines to my Republican friends who may be contemplating voting against this bill, and who yet feel a lively interest in the outcome of the approaching Chicago convention.

I may add that if Mr. Roosevelt succeeds in making himself the Republican candidate and in having himself elected, he may not wait for a Republican Congress to set the Philippines free, but may, of his own volition, withdraw the American troops, pull down the American flag, and grant the Filipinos their freedom. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Why does not the Democratic President pull down the flag and withdraw the troops?

Mr. JONES. Because there is no authority under the Constitution for such action. It was Mr. Roosevelt, who, in the absence of constitutional authority, took the Isthmus of Panama. No Democratic President ever did such a thing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SNYDER. He did not pull down the United States flag.

Mr. JONES. No; he did not pull down the United States flag, but he pulled down the flag of a friendly nation—the flag of Colombia.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman state what Democratic President it was that pulled down the flag of Hawaii?

Mr. JONES. It is preposterous to say that the Filipinos are ignorant as to the provisions of this bill. It has been published in full in the Philippines in both English and Spanish and in at least one of the principal native languages of the islands. It has been published too in pamphlet form in Tagalog, and I am informed by an American friend in Manila that one native bookstore sold within a short period more than 100,000 copies of this publication. It has the support of all the political parties in the Philippines, and Gov. Gen. Harrison has cabled his approval and expressed the earnest hope that it may be speedily enacted into law. In the face of such testimony as this how vain it is for Members to assert upon this floor that the Filipinos do not desire their freedom.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman refer to Senate bill 381?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Senate bill 381 has ever been published in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is the only man in the world who thinks so.

Mr. JONES. I am so informed, and I have in my possession a pamphlet in which this bill is translated into Tagalog, and I shall be glad to hand it to the gentleman for his enlightenment. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is it not a fact that all political parties have approved the Jones bill for two years?

Mr. JONES. Yes; and it is also a fact that they all approved the Senate bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Do they approve any kind of a bill?

Mr. JONES. Any bill that is an advance over the previous bill; any bill that will give them their freedom and independence a year sooner than another bill will do it.

Mr. Chairman, that great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, is best known to the world as the author of the Declaration of Independence, and yet it may be truthfully affirmed of him that his highest title to fame rests upon a broader and firmer foundation than even the authorship of that immortal document.

He was the greatest apostle of human liberty that the world has ever produced—the most courageous as he was the ablest champion of free popular government known to ancient or modern history. The political aphorisms of Thomas Jefferson are so universally true as to be applicable to all the peoples of the earth, to the inhabitants of the Eastern as well as those of the Western Hemisphere. If they could be read and understood by every patriotic American citizen there would be no Philippine problem to vex our minds and disturb our peace.

When Thomas Jefferson asserted that "Every man and every body of men on earth possesses the right to self-government," he did not intend to be understood as limiting that axiomatic declaration to the people who constituted the American colonists then struggling for their independence.

In his first inaugural address, that great document in which are formulated with matchless perspicuity and force the essential principles of democracy, these words are to be found:

Sometimes it is said that man can not be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

But nowhere, and at no time, has the imperishable truth that self-government is a right inherent in all men been so clearly and so strikingly set forth as in these words of the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the principles enunciated by Thomas Jefferson have never been repudiated by the party which he founded.



3 1867 00058 6532

The Democratic Party stands to-day precisely where it stood a century ago. In one form or another it has reaffirmed its fealty to the principles laid down by its great founder in every platform which it has ever adopted. In every national platform which it has promulgated since the Philippine Islands were ceded to the United States it has solemnly declared itself in favor of the independence of those islands, and my faith in the integrity of the party to which I have given the adherence of a lifetime is so unfaltering that I can never believe it will be guilty of the political perfidy and cowardice of proclaiming itself as favoring a policy which it is not willing to defend and enforce. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, that in discussing a measure designed to carry into effect Democratic promises of independence for the Philippines, it was not inappropriate that I should invoke the power and authority of the mighty name of the greatest of all Democrats to the end that the Democratic Party, now that it is clothed with full legislative and executive power, shall not falter in what I hold to be its highest duty. For I can not if I would disguise the fact that there are those who, professing to believe in its principles, are nevertheless endeavoring to prevent the consummation of the lofty and patriotic purposes to which it is so solemnly committed. They would upon one pretext or another, have the Democratic Party, now that it has been given the opportunity to redeem its promises, abandon its position in respect to the Philippines and cravenly acquiesce in a policy which Democrats for a decade and a half have denounced with one accord as prompted by commercial greed, as unconstitutional, unpatriotic, and cruelly unjust both to the American and Filipino people—a disgraceful policy of criminal aggression which, if persisted in, must result in the destruction of the free principles upon which this Republic was founded. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I would not, of course, be understood as intimating that all who hold that the time has not come when the Filipinos can be safely intrusted with their freedom are inspired by commercial greed or any other unworthy motive; but, whatever may be their incentives, Democrats at least are strangely unmindful of the teachings of Jefferson, and either ignorant of or indifferent to their party's position upon this great, burning, living issue.

I do not minimize in the least the influences of a commercial and business character that are being exerted to defeat Philippine independence, and I know, too, that there are still other powerful influences at work with the same end in view, but my faith in the patriotism and sense of justice and fair dealing of the membership of this body is such that I do not permit myself to doubt what the issue will be.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to say, in conclusion, that fervently believing with that great apostle of human liberty, Thomas Jefferson, "that the people of every country are the only safe guardians of their own rights," my prayer is that the day is not far distant when we shall see arise in the Far East a free and independent Christian nation, to be known throughout the world as the "Republic of the Philippine Islands." [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Syracuse, N. Y.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

DATE DUE

**OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES LIBRARY
PHILLIPS ACADEMY
ANDOVER, MASS.**

